

New York Tribune.

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

SATURDAY, JULY 17, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, 400 N. York Building, New York, N. Y. Registered office: 400 N. York Building, New York, N. Y. Building, No. 154 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

One month, 50c	Three months, \$1.50	Six months, \$2.80	One year, \$5.00
One month, 40c	Three months, \$1.20	Six months, \$2.20	One year, \$4.00
One month, 30c	Three months, \$1.00	Six months, \$1.80	One year, \$3.00
One month, 20c	Three months, \$0.75	Six months, \$1.40	One year, \$2.50
One month, 10c	Three months, \$0.40	Six months, \$0.75	One year, \$1.25

FOREIGN RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

One month, \$1.00	Three months, \$2.80	Six months, \$5.00	One year, \$9.00
One month, \$0.75	Three months, \$2.20	Six months, \$4.00	One year, \$7.00
One month, \$0.50	Three months, \$1.50	Six months, \$2.80	One year, \$5.00
One month, \$0.30	Three months, \$0.90	Six months, \$1.80	One year, \$3.00

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Peace and Mediation.

Since it is apparent that a well defined and, in part, concerted effort is now being made in this country to promote the mediation of the United States in the world war and to spread broadcast the idea that there is in Europe a real readiness to welcome such mediation, it is necessary to warn Americans that such agitation is based on wholly false premises.

There is no desire, no willingness, no intention among the enemies of Germany to accept mediation or desist from the war at the present time. The reason is simple; peace now would mean for Germany a victory almost as complete as her statement hoped for at the outset, and would open the way for later victories, which would complete the great work the German people have undertaken.

Peace must be considered, if at all, on the basis of conditions preceding the war. Let us grant that Germany might consent to evacuate Northern France, Belgium and Western Poland, receiving in return the colonies taken by her enemies. This last is impossible, for Japan, Australia and the Union of South Africa would not recede what they have won.

But let us accept the premise. What then is the situation? In the course of the war Germany has practically destroyed all the industrial machinery of Belgium, of Northern France and of Poland. The mines have been flooded, the factories burned or swept clean of machinery; cities have been wiped out. If peace comes, industrial Germany would, since, save for a small agricultural region in the east and the city of Muhlhausen in the west, no portion of Germany has been ravaged, immediately resume business, having eliminated certain rivals.

This is the industrial side. But there is an even more serious military side. Who can believe Belgium after her terrible experience would again venture to oppose her feeble resistance to German "terribles"? If not annexed, Belgium, were the war to end to-day, would be forever cowed. And France? So far she has borne the heat of the day and suffered the great losses. Peace now would set the seal to the last testament of the French nation. Never again could it hope to make face against German numbers and German organization. Every Frenchman knows this. This is the whole sum of French opinion to-day.

There is this to be considered, too: Germany has occupied most of Belgium and part of France and of Poland. But she has conquered Austria-Hungary. Henceforth Austria and Hungary, if the war now ends, will be component parts of an empire ruled from Berlin, as the whole military fabric of the central empire is now.

This means the perpetuation of the age-long strife for liberty of the Slavs in Austria and the Balkans, and with them the Rumanians and the Italians. It means that the Czechs, the Serbs, the Croats, the Ruthenians, will be subjected to a tyranny more terrible than in the past; that 25,000,000 of men and women will be denied all the things we in America hold dearest.

Finally there is Turkey. It, too, has been conquered by Germany, has become not alone a military adjunct, but, since the Sultan is the head of the Mahometan Church, the centre of agitation against British, French and Italian rule in Mahometan countries. To leave this power in German hands is for France, Italy and, over all, Great Britain to open the way to perpetual civil war in India and North Africa, from the Straits Settlements to Tangier.

As it now stands Germany is a victor. She has not destroyed her enemies, but she has defeated them. Her misfortunes, so far as she has suffered any, have come from the fact that her diplomacy failed where that of Bismarck succeeded; she has not been able to deal with her enemies separately. But if peace comes now this mistake will not be repeated.

Against Napoleon Europe made precisely the mistake peace would be now. Again and again coalitions were formed and broke down until the last was made on the same basis as the present agreement of the contemporary allies. Once all nations were pledged to common action against Napoleon, the end was in sight. Separately he was able to defeat them again and again.

Peace now in Europe would be the surrender of Europe to Germany, and Europe realizes it. In France, in England, in Russia, in Italy there is no mistaking the fact, and there is no intention of making peace. Not the smallest. That is why it would be unwise for President Wilson to offer his services as mediator, and it is self-deception for Americans to believe there is hope of peace.

Actually we are at the beginning of a war. Two and perhaps three years more is the shortest space of time in which it is reasonable to look for peace. Let Americans consider what the feeling of the North toward peace is in

1863, before Gettysburg and Vicksburg. The parallel is sufficiently complete. The advantages possessed by the South approximate those now held by Germany, and no peace could have been made that would not have been a recognition of Southern independence.

The essential point to recall to-day is that peace now would mean a German victory, and that while she has so far defeated her foes Germany has, as yet, neither conquered them nor convinced them that she can conquer them. No one of her foes shows any signs of physical or moral exhaustion such as must come before a nation retires from the field.

On the other hand, there is a fair reason to believe that German prospects will hardly improve. At all events, that is what Paris, London, Petrograd and Rome believe. To their mind, and they will decide the question, German success is at its culminating point. To them Germany stands where Japan did when the Peace of Portsmouth was signed. And they have no intention of following Russia's example then.

Since Germany's enemies are in this state of mind American offers of mediation will be accepted as acts friendly to Germany and unfriendly to them. It will appear to them, not without some warrant, that we are deliberately aiding the Germans to harvest the fruits of their endeavors. We know how Germany feels toward us. Why earn equal hatred in all other nations?

Never since the war began was there less prospect of immediate peace. Never did all circumstances point so plainly to a long drawn out struggle. Let us then be deluded neither by natural and sincere pacifists nor by the industrious agents of Germany. Mediation is impossible. To attempt it is to injure the country without serving any end save that of one of the great parties to a world war.

Preparing for a Funeral.

In the political comedy now being staged in the Constitutional Convention at Albany no roles are allotted to those oldtime favorites of the hustings—"Shall the People Rule?" and "Vox Populi, Vox Dei." The convention is proceeding on the comfortable theory that it owes nothing to the voters and can afford to disregard their rights and wishes.

It would be honey to the palates of our constitutional revisers if they could do what the framers of Virginia's present constitution did—proclaim their work without submitting it to the voters. Many of the constitution makers at Albany must harbor that flattering delusion. Otherwise it would be hard to account for the submission by the Committee on Suffrage of propositions compelling the voters to give up the direct primary and to go back to the convention system in nominating candidates for elective state offices and for judgeships.

The nominating primary has been the greatest practical achievement so far in the fight to restore control of parties and control of government to the rank and file of the voters. It is the most effective check yet put on boss rule and invisible government, and for that reason the bosses, as yet only partly dispossessed in this state, hate it and seek to get rid of it.

To include in the new constitution a provision restricting the use of this new weapon of emancipation would be to insult the electorate. Does the convention want to frame a constitution doomed in advance to rejection for the purpose of prolonging the constitutional status quo? It looks that way. Rejection would be made absolutely sure by asking the voters to vote themselves back into the meshes of the odious boss system.

Submarine Humanity.

There is a certain want of co-ordination between the German Foreign Office and the German Overseas News Agency. The latter, reviewing the recent exploits of the piratical submarine commanders, remarks that the number of persons they have killed is "remarkably small," a circumstance to be attributed to their "using every precaution and giving ample warning and time for crews to leave their ships if no resistance was attempted." Accidents will happen, of course, as in the case of the Lusitania. But then, as we have since learned from the Imperial Government, "it was to be expected that a night ship like the Lusitania would remain above water long enough, even after the torpedoing, to permit passengers to enter the ship's boats"; it was therefore hardly necessary to give warning on that occasion.

The official explanation of the sinking of the Nebraska conveys no hint of "ample warning," though it is not pretended that "resistance was attempted" or that the vessel was so mighty as to justify the expectation that she would stay afloat. The deed was an "unfortunate accident" only because the commander of the submarine was unaware that he was attacking an American vessel; for the rest it was entirely justifiable. This seems more in accordance with Tirpitz's conception of justice, and the wonder is that the compilers of Overseas News are permitted to hint that this conception is in any way modified by humane motives.

St. Clair McKelway.

St. Clair McKelway was a journalist with the happy faculty of impressing his personality on his work. Mr. Bryan only the other day criticised the American ideal of impersonalism in editorial writing—an ideal which gives a newspaper an authority quite its own, independently of the many writers who contribute to the editorial columns. He held up for praise the French system of signed editorials, each writer being responsible for his own views and the newspaper merely serving as a vehicle for presenting those views to the public.

But there are often circumstances which give an American editorial writer

a chance to appeal more or less directly to his readers. Mr. McKelway's long service in the field which "The Brooklyn Eagle" has made its own brought him such an opportunity. He sustained an intimate personal relation with the many thousands of people in this city who enjoyed his vivacity, his versatility, his fund of political reminiscences and his encyclopedic manner of discussing current events. His experience in Washington lifted him above narrowness of judgment and furnished him with a national perspective. He was positive in opinion, but always had knowledge to back up his opinion. He was interesting, even if sometimes prolix; always generous, fair and high-minded; living up to the most exacting standards of a profession which he honored and loved.

As a citizen, too, he was active and useful. He gave much time and labor to the work of public education in this state, serving for many years on the Board of Regents of the University of New York, of which body he became chancellor in 1913. He was a champion of civic betterment along all lines, economic, social and political, and an untiring advocate of that self-education on the part of a community which alone can guarantee efficiency under our democratic system. Mr. McKelway's death is a loss to the world of journalism, to the city and to the state.

Diagnosticians "of Large Experience."

In declaring his concurrence in the verdict provided him "by way of advice and aid" in determining the present mental state of Harry Thaw Justice Hendrick took occasion to deprecate the manifest evils attending the use of medical testimony in cases involving questions of sanity and responsibility. There are few who do not agree with him in deploring these evils and share his hopes that by joint action of the legal and medical professions they may speedily be abolished. But if they are to be abolished it is to be hoped that they will not be replaced by worse evils.

The trial that has just been concluded was unique in the annals of the state. Never before, as Justice Hendrick observed, had the question of a man's sanity been submitted under these conditions to the judgment of a jury. Let us hope that it will never happen again. For days witnesses, without the least pretence to any extraordinary understanding of mental disorders, were allowed to offer their diagnoses on the strength of a casual acquaintance with the relator, to say whether or not they thought he was of sound mind. Their testimony, Justice Hendrick says, impressed him deeply, because they were "women of undoubted high repute" and "men of large experience who know the difference between a sane and insane man."

Here is a begging of the whole question at issue. Are men of large experience in the common affairs of life really capable of detecting by casual observation the signs of an unsound mind? If so, they must have more skill than those who have devoted their lives to the study of mental disease, for nothing is more generally acknowledged by psychiatrists than the difficulty often encountered in discovering evidence of insanity, even in eliciting the delusions of patients who are known to be subject to them. One of the medical witnesses admitted on the stand that Thaw during the present trial had shown no sign of mental derangement. This admission evidently made a great impression on the jury. But what does it amount to? Absolutely nothing as far as the question of sanity is concerned. There is a classic example of an inmate of an asylum in Paris who completely deceived the government commissioner during a long and exhaustive mental examination. At last it was decided that the man was absolutely sane; the discharge papers were brought to him to sign, and it was only then that his delusion was revealed. He signed himself "Jesus Christ."

Gross delusions of this kind are sometimes concealed for long periods. If Thaw is a paranoiac there is nothing wonderful in his apparently sane behavior. Spitzka speaks of a patient of his who harbored the wildest delusions, yet to one unacquainted with the facts their delusional nature would not have been apparent, for his "manner and address were simply such as would be expected of a courtly and prosperous man of business." Nor is it always easy even for medical men of considerable experience to detect the signs of insanity. Some years ago a lawyer asked a physician and a well known psychiatrist to examine a patient who had been committed as insane. Both reported in favor of his release, basing their decision on "the calm and rational behavior of the patient" and the testimony of an assistant asylum physician who had "observed nothing 'wrong' about him." Six weeks later the man was recommitted on the certificate of the very two who had pronounced him sane.

This is a common experience. A few years ago there was a great clamor in London over a paranoiac who was supposed to be unlawfully confined. The Home Secretary made inquiries and learned that during three or four years' detention the man's behavior had been exemplary. He was released, relapsed instantly, repeated the offence for which he had been originally committed, and was recommitted the very next day. Examples of this kind might be multiplied indefinitely. That such patients can often conceal their delusions for a long time, that they are frequently quite orderly, that their consciousness may be unclouded, and that they may live for years without any marked mental deterioration—these are circumstances not always understood by men "of large experience," and the question is whether large experience of a general kind qualifies a man to diagnose disease.

A circumstance which made a manifest impression on the judge was a disagreement between two of the medical witnesses as to whether Thaw was a paranoiac or a constitutional inferior of the paranoiac type. "What I want to find out," he said, "is how it can help me and the jury if the alienists disagree." In reality the point is less important than it appears. Psychiatric nomenclature is by no means precise. There has been a great deal of regrouping in recent years; some patients who would formerly have passed as paranoiacs are now more often put in one of the classes of dementia praecox, others have been reckoned as psychic inferiors, and so forth. There may be an absolute distinction between the true paranoiac and the others, but too much importance should not be attached to labels and symptom groupings. There are some who still use quite a different method of classification, who even refuse to recognize the conception of such a class as dementia praecox, for instance, but that does not mean that they regard the patients counted under this head as sane.

In all of the Thaw trials there was too much hairsplitting on these points, and to the public the one fact manifest was that the expert witnesses were at odds. There was some excuse for derision on this account, but what is far more significant is that one of Thaw's own doctors, who three years ago was put on the stand to combat the opinion that he was "insane," was obliged to admit on cross-examination that he did regard him as constitutionally inferior.

Thomas A. Edison ought to strengthen materially the teaching staff of the Josephson University.

New York extends Pittsburgh its sympathy.

"ON BASTILLE DAY"

All True Democrats Must Love France, "Foster Mother of Liberty."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I feel that I must tell you of the profound satisfaction and enthusiasm with which I read the exceedingly beautiful editorial in your columns this morning, headed "On Bastille Day."

The ardent appreciation of and love for France therein evidenced—for the glorious spirit, the idealism and the heroism of that nation, for the lofty, united soul of a whole people—touched a deeply accordant note in my heart, and I desire to express my gratitude to The Tribune.

As your article reminds us, we should, we must, realize what we owe to France—e. g., many of our most cherished rights and liberties, and, above all, we owe to her the infinite help and inspiration of the most exacting conceptions of and attainments in true democracy that the world has ever known!

It is my belief that all true democrats must have a warm place in their hearts for France, the foster mother of liberty!

EVA INGERSOLL-BROWN.

Dobbs Ferry, July 14, 1915.

"A War of Ideas."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Being always ready to be guided by superior wisdom, it has been a source of considerable anxiety to me that I could not remain entirely neutral in regard to the great war, but after reading your clear and comprehensive article "A War of Ideas" in your issue of the 12th inst. I saw where the trouble was. Long may The Tribune live to "throw light" on the subject.

Right and wrong are clearly definable, else where would we stand? When one nation shows utter disregard of humanity, of the rights of neutral nations and of international law there must be a change.

I think it may be found in history where the name of a people has been changed. If this should be one of the results of this awful conflict, as we have already seen in the case of the name of a great city may not one of the nations now at war for obvious reasons be called "Necessity?"

SAMUEL WILLIAMS.

Windsor, Vt., July 14, 1915.

Congratulations.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your to-day's editorial leader "On Bastille Day" is a classic. It is superb! Congratulations!

EDWARD F. STEVENS.

Shoreham, Long Island, July 14, 1915.

"A Masterly Elucidation."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I wish to heartily thank you for your masterly editorial in yesterday's Tribune on the occasion of the Bastille Day.

It is one of the finest editorials I have ever read in any paper, here or abroad, and is a masterly elucidation of what the 14th of July stands for in French history.

I have sent it to several of my friends in France, some of whom stand high in governmental positions.

L. LEVY.

New York, July 15, 1915.

Why Not Show Force?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Kindly permit one of your readers to express his highest appreciation of The Tribune's war editorials. I believe it can be said without fear of being successfully contradicted that those articles represent the high-water mark of editorial achievement.

Can The Tribune enlighten us on these points:

It is now apparent that note writing will not protect American lives and property if Germany finds it to her interest to destroy them, and when our nation is confronted by that state of facts why would it not be the most likely means of preventing war if the next note were presented while our regulars were concentrating and the entire national guard mobilizing for summer maneuvers? It seems entirely probable that if Germany saw our slumbering but tremendous military power awakening the tenor of her notes might change.

Further, has not the time arrived when our splendid navy should convoy ships carrying the American flag or bearing American citizens and their families? The Tribune thought that the United States would be forced to enter the war, and that thus the Allies would win. But I am proud to say that the people did not listen to those papers which would have their lives sacrificed in order to reach their goal. The people and the President acted wisely, and they refused to be fooled into a war. I ask you the plain, simple question, "Is it worth the shedding of the blood of a million poor people in order to avenge the killing of a hundred rich ones who had nothing else to do than to go to Europe in a time of war on a hellish ship filled with ammunition?" Although the sinking of the Lusitania is deplorable, I do not believe that any sane person can say that the United States should sacrifice a million souls to avenge it. These people threw their dice with Death and they lost.

In all these instances which I have pointed out you have adopted a policy and have followed it, whether right or wrong, and through thick and thin. You made an angel out of the side which you happened to attack your self to, while the other side had no choice but of being a devil. The motto, "My country, right or wrong," is fast going to the cemetery. I sincerely hope that the motto which you have taken, "My policy, right or wrong," will at once follow its cousin's footsteps. A few months ago you opened a campaign having for its banner "The Truth, the Whole Truth and Nothing but the Truth,"

J. BRAND.

New York, July 15, 1915.

England the World's Bully.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In a recent letter to The Tribune by one who points out England's historic antagonism to the United States, and states that he is a Civil War veteran and citizen, he might have added that England's aid to the Confederacy in an endeavor to break us in two and consequently weaken us to such an extent that she could bully us indefinitely was but the culmination of British bullying and domineering.

It does not appear that she was particularly humane when she sent her hired assassins, the brutal Hessians, to kill off our American "brothers," nor do we forget that her tactics on the high seas in stopping American ships and shanghaiing their crews resulted in the War of 1812.

And who was it but England who said we must not fortify the Panama Canal, which was built and paid for with good United States dollars?

England is the bully of the world; her soldiers and sailors, take it from her, can whip anything twice their weight and size. The conscious superiority, brag and bluster of the average English person beats anything we Americans ever accused of; and though I love the Dickens stories, I can hardly appreciate with affection the characteristic British personality of the man who wrote them and who could see little to praise and much to ridicule when he visited our hospitable land.

English gentry tolerate our wealthy snobs and let them buy an occasional titled husband or two, but only with condescension. We are awfully raw, don't know, but our dollars are good, what?

England stops our ships on the high seas to-day (what few we have) and is very high and mighty in her dictatorial way as to their disposition. Nor do we hear much in the way of protest from Washington.

Least the writer of this be accused of pro-German leanings, let it be said, though it doesn't matter, that he is all Yankee to the Prussian ego with its inhuman, uncivilized methods, and that he considers the success of the Allies to be a world necessity; but where is British efficiency (?) that can find no way to counteract German submarine "Getters"? How about that Queen of the Seas navy?

"Blood is thicker than water," but a "fish" and several "tushes" on our Yankee blood being British. We are old enough to walk unaided. I should venture a guess that our parent British blood was pretty well diluted with several other kinds. It seems to me that when our forebears fought for a country they could call their own they cut loose from foreign blood entanglements.

Let's be United States and bestow our sympathies where we please, in the meantime cutting out all Bryanized floundering and get busy fortifying ourselves against foreign aggression from whatever source, quit making phrases and bandying words and looking for help from politicians, mealy mouthed, sanctimonious vote watchers. Get busy, you Washington! This country is no divine-right-forerulers proposition. You were put there because you claimed you were capable of doing the work you are paid to do. You worked hard to get the job and the people who took you at your own valuation now ask you to show your worth. Otherwise they will get some one who can.

A. M. F.

New York, July 2, 1915.

National Size and Wealth.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Please answer me in your paper two questions:

1. How big is Germany in size compared with the State of Texas?
2. Which is the wealthiest country in gold reserve and otherwise, France, Germany or England?

J. J. SCHMITT.

Purchase, N. Y., June 28, 1915.

[1. Germany's area is 208,830 square miles; that of Texas, 262,398 square miles. 2. The latest estimates place the wealth of the United Kingdom at \$85,000,000,000, of Germany at \$80,000,000,000 and of France at \$50,000,000,000. But France is credited with the greatest stock of gold.—Ed.]

THE GERMAN NOTE

Not the Kind That Ought To Be Addressed to a Free People.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir:

Oh, say, can you see by the dawn's early light
What so proudly we hail'd at the twilight's
last gleaming,
Whose broad stripes and bright stars, thro' the
perilous fight,
O'er the ramparts we watch'd, were so gallantly
streaming?
And the rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting
in air,
Gave proof thro' the night that our flag was
still there;
Oh, say, does that star-spangled banner yet
wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the
brave?

Does it, ye sons of Washington, Jackson, Lincoln and Grant?

What say you, you of the North, the South, the East and the West, to the spirits of those that have gone before to make this the land of the free and the home of the brave about the note that "Bux-fuzz" Kultur has handed you through your representative, the President?

Some note, isn't it? Bears all the earmarks of its father, doesn't it?

Have we, as Americans, after more than one hundred years of growth and development, intellectually, artistically, scientifically, in worldly standing, in wealth, and all that goes to make this life the best ever reached the exact step in our upward climb where we are ready to pass our rights and titles to live and move and think, free and untrammelled, over to him who says, "We Germans have little esteem and less respect for Americans?"

The present tense situation demands something more than just passive support of Mr. Wilson. All Americans should back him for civilizational and all that goes to work this world toward the ideal is in the hopper of the world's scale, and no one should passively let Prussian incantations outweigh it.

If you do not agree with me, before forming an opinion read this decalogue and decide if you are ready to accept it and hand it down to your posterity as being your ideal of government:

"We Hohenzollerns take our crown from God alone."

"On me the spirit of God has descended."

"Nothing must be settled in this world without the intervention . . . of . . . the German Emperor."

"He who listens to public opinion runs a danger of inflicting immense harm on . . . the state."

"Christian morality is farcical; fanaticism, too, and not of the real world, but the abstract, fervent faith of hypnotized men and women."

"The peace of Europe is only a secondary matter for us."

"The Belgians should not be shot dead. They should be . . . so left as to make impossible all hope of recovery."

"You must remember (referring to the French people) that we have not come to make war on you, but to bring to you a higher civilization."

"We need to enlarge our territorial area; hence, against England we fight for booty. Our real enemy is England. We have to crush absolutely perfidious Albion . . . subdue her to such an extent that her influence all over the world is broken forever."

Read this decalogue over carefully, and compare it with what has gone before; six months from now read it again and make a new comparison.

As surely as the Bible says "the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head," so surely will civilization be Germany's Nemesis.

LAMONT.

Brooklyn, July 10, 1915.

FINDS US TOO PARTISAN

Much Can Be Said for Both Sides in Politics or War.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have followed the varying fortunes of your paper for the last ten years. During that time I have noticed a tendency which does little honor to the paper founded by Horace Greeley. In fact, this tendency is in direct opposition to the standards and ideals set up by that great journalist.

When I first began reading your paper it stood for the "Old Guard" and was against everything that was not the "Old Guard." No matter what the bosses or grafters among the G. O. P. did, it was right and just, and could never be otherwise.

About two years ago The Tribune opened its eyes and saw that everything was not right in the Republican party and it suddenly changed its views. While before it could not see anything in that party except the very highest and truest ideals, it now turned around and saw that it abounded in graft and corruption. Its leaders were corrupt and consequently any one who had a stain of the "Old Guard" in him was condemned.

However, The Tribune did not entirely desert the Republican party, but it joined the forces of the Young Republicans. Previously The Tribune was too dead about the faults in the Republican party, but now it was too alive about them. I maintain that there is no party or class of men who are entirely angels, but that, on the other hand, there is no party or class of men who are entirely devils.

This spirit of adopting a policy and prejudicing yourself against all others manifested itself when the present great war broke out. When the European powers became involved in war the United States decided to remain neutral. The United States was supposed to favor either side, and its only concern was to see that its rights were not transgressed. But although the United States was neutral I am sorry to say that the same cannot be said of the American press (including yourself). The Tribune instead of remaining neutral openly ranged itself on the side of the Allies. It took the same view of the warring powers as it did in its other policies. This time the Allies were the angels and the Teutons were the devils. Whenever any one lifted up his voice and proclaimed new German atrocities The Tribune believed them without question. But whenever any one said the same thing of the Allies among whom are Russian, African and Asiatic soldiers, many of whom are barbarians The Tribune declared them lies or else did not print them. I do not mean to say that the Germans did not commit any atrocities, but what I do mean to say is that on the other hand it cannot be said of the Allies that they are as innocent as a newborn babe.

After the Lusitania horror The Tribune openly came out for war against Germany. The Tribune would not stop at even bringing to the United States into the slaughter in order to achieve its selfish ends. The Tribune thought that the United States would be forced to enter the war, and that thus the Allies would win. But I am proud to say that the people did not listen to those papers which would have their lives sacrificed in order to reach their goal. The people and the President acted wisely, and they refused to be fooled into a war. I ask you the plain, simple question, "Is it worth the shedding of the blood of a million poor people in order to avenge the killing of a hundred rich ones who had nothing else to do than to go to Europe in a time of war on a hellish ship filled with ammunition?" Although the sinking of the Lusitania is deplorable, I do not believe that any sane person can say that the United States should sacrifice a million souls to avenge it. These people threw their dice with Death and they lost.

In all these instances which I have pointed out you have adopted a policy and have followed it, whether right or wrong, and through thick and thin. You made an angel out of the side which you happened to attack your self to, while the other side had no choice but of being a devil. The motto, "My country, right or wrong," is fast going to the cemetery. I sincerely hope that the motto which you have taken, "My policy, right or wrong," will at once follow its cousin's footsteps. A few months ago you opened a campaign having for its banner "The Truth, the Whole Truth and Nothing but the Truth,"

J. BRAND.

New York, July 15, 1915.

THE GERMAN NOTE

Not the Kind That Ought To Be Addressed to a Free People.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir:

Oh, say, can you see by the dawn's early light
What so proudly we hail'd at the twilight's
last gleaming,
Whose broad stripes and bright stars, thro' the
perilous fight,
O'er the ramparts we watch'd, were so gallantly
streaming?
And the rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting
in air,
Gave proof thro' the night that our flag was
still there;
Oh, say, does that star-spangled banner yet
wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the
brave?

Does it, ye sons of Washington, Jackson, Lincoln and Grant?

What say you, you of the North, the South, the East and the West, to the spirits of those that have gone before to make this the land of the free and the home of the brave about the note that "Bux-fuzz" Kultur has handed you through your representative, the President?

Some note, isn't it? Bears all the earmarks of its father, doesn't it?

Have we, as Americans, after more than one hundred years of growth and development, intellectually, artistically, scientifically, in worldly standing, in wealth, and all that goes to make this life the best ever reached the exact step in our upward climb where we are ready to pass our rights and titles to live and move and think, free and untrammelled, over to him who says, "We Germans have little esteem and less respect for Americans?"

The present tense situation demands something more than just passive support of Mr. Wilson. All Americans should back him for civilizational and all that goes to work this world toward the ideal is in the hopper of the world's scale, and no one should passively let Prussian incantations outweigh it.

If you do not agree with me, before forming an opinion read this decalogue and decide if you are ready to accept it and hand it down to your posterity as being your ideal of government:

"We Hohenzollerns take our crown from God alone."

"On me the spirit of God has descended."

"Nothing must be settled in this world without the intervention . . . of . . . the German Emperor."

"He who listens to public opinion runs a danger of inflicting immense harm on . . . the state."

"Christian morality is farcical; fanaticism, too, and not of the real world, but the abstract, fervent faith of hypnotized men and women."

"The peace of Europe is only a secondary matter for us."

"The Belgians should not be shot dead. They should be . . . so left as to make impossible all hope of recovery."

"You must remember (referring to the French people) that we have not come to make war on you, but to bring to you a higher civilization."

"We need to enlarge our territorial area; hence, against England we fight for booty. Our real enemy is England. We have to crush absolutely perfidious Albion . . . subdue her to such an extent that her influence all over the world is broken forever."

Read this decalogue over carefully, and compare it with what has gone before; six months from now read it again and make a new comparison.

As surely as the Bible says "the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head," so surely will civilization be Germany's Nemesis.

LAMONT.

Brooklyn, July 10, 1915.

Yes, Why Not?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Is a German band allowed to play in the streets of this city and play "The Watch on the Rhine," as they have been doing for the last week?

New York, July 13, 1915.

THE GERMAN NOTE

Not the Kind That Ought To Be Addressed to a Free People.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir:

Oh, say, can you see by the dawn's early light
What so proudly we hail'd at the twilight's
last gleaming,
Whose broad stripes and bright stars, thro' the
perilous fight,
O'er the ramparts we watch'd, were so gallantly
streaming?
And the rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting
in air,
Gave proof thro' the night that our flag was
still there;
Oh, say, does that star-spangled banner yet
wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the
brave?

Does it, ye sons of Washington, Jackson, Lincoln and Grant?

What say you, you of the North, the South, the East and the West, to the spirits of those that have gone before to make this the land of the free and the home of the brave about the note that "Bux-fuzz" Kultur has handed you through your representative, the President?

Some note, isn't it? Bears all the earmarks of its father, doesn't it?

Have we, as Americans, after more than one hundred years of growth and development, intellectually, artistically, scientifically, in worldly standing, in wealth, and all that goes to make this life the best ever reached the exact step in our upward climb where we are ready to pass our rights and titles to live and move and think, free and untrammelled, over to him who says, "We Germans have little esteem and less respect for Americans?"

The present tense situation demands something more than just passive support of Mr. Wilson. All Americans should back him for civilizational and all that goes to work this world toward the ideal is in the hopper of the world's scale, and no one should passively let Prussian incantations outweigh it.

If you do not agree with me, before forming an opinion read this decalogue and decide if you are ready to accept it and hand it down to your posterity as being your ideal of government:

"We Hohenzollerns take our crown from God alone."

"On me the spirit of God has descended."

"Nothing must be settled in this world without the intervention . . . of . . . the German Emperor."

"He who listens to public opinion runs a danger of inflicting immense harm on . . . the state."

"Christian morality is farcical; fanaticism, too, and not of the real world, but the abstract, fervent faith of hypnotized men and women."

"The peace of Europe is only a secondary matter for us."

"The Belgians should not be shot dead. They should be . . . so left as to make impossible all hope of recovery."

"You must remember (referring to the French people) that we have not come to make war on you, but to bring to you a higher civilization."

"We need to enlarge our territorial area; hence, against England we fight for booty. Our real enemy is England. We have to crush absolutely perfidious Albion . . . subdue her to such an extent that her influence all over the world is broken forever."

Read this decalogue over carefully, and compare it with what has gone before; six months from now read it again and make a new comparison.

As surely as the Bible says "the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head," so surely will civilization be Germany's Nemesis.

LAMONT.

Brooklyn, July 10, 1915.